

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

## **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claim 1 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 2, 5, 8, 11 and 13-16 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

### **Objection to the Claims**

Claims 2, 5 and 13-16 were objected to for containing informalities. Applicant submits that amendments to the claims have addressed these informalities. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the objections is respectfully requested.

### Objection to the Specification

The Specification has been objected to for containing hyperlinks and the informality of “is allowed is” in ¶ 0010. Applicant submits that amendments to the Specification have addressed these informalities. Additionally, ¶¶ 0014 and 0016 have been amended to address an objection made to the drawings, as noted below. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the objections is respectfully requested.

### Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to because the reference character “1” designated both main folder (¶ 0014) and main locker (Fig. 3.). Applicant submits that the amendment to ¶¶ 0014 and

0016 addresses this objection. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2,-10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0054750 to de Jong et al. ("de Jong") in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0174842 to Challener. Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Jong in view of Challener and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,901,227 to Perlman. Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Jong in view of Challener and further in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0010715 to Winiger et al. ("Winiger"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

De Jong describes a system that controls access to digital content. The system includes one or more content provisioners that send an authenticated digital content request to users that are associated with the digital content and authorized to access the digital content. De Jong, Abstract. De Jong describes a content repository 320 that receives the authenticated digital content request 360 and returns the corresponding digital content 365. De Jong, ¶ 0099; Fig. 3. De Jong describes that the content repository 320 can include a content database 340 that stores digital content and may also include a repository manager 345, which can include an acceptor 380 that accepts a token and determines whether access to the digital content is authorized based on the content. De Jong, ¶ 0099; Fig. 3. De Jong fails to describe the structure within the

content database 340 regarding storage and access to particular folders. In particular, de Jong ¶¶ 0098, 0109, 0110 fail to disclose these aspects of the content database.

Challenger describes a system and method for storing a user's private key on a TCPA-enabled server. Abstract. Challenger describes that asymmetric encryption is performed using both a public key and a private key. The private key is only available to a recipient of a confidential communication. Challenger. ¶ 0004.

Independent claim 2 of the present application has now been amended so as to recite a functional locker which provides at least one of "a personal locker, wherein a reference to first files of the first user is storable in the personal locker only by the first user and displayable only to the first user," "a provisioning locker, wherein a first reference to a second file available to another user is storable therein only by the first user," and "a receiving locker, wherein a third file of a second user of the users is storable therein only by the second user, the receiving locker being configured, when opened, to provide to the first user a sender user reference relating to the storage of the third file and to a sender user defined security requirement." Support of the amendments to claim 2 may be found, for example, at ¶ 0018 of the specification. The recited functional lockers (personal, provisioning, and receiving locker) each require references to files of a user stored only by that user (e.g., a first user, a second user), and which user has access to the stored references therein that is different dependent on the type of functional locker (e.g., a personal, provisioning, and receiving locker). It is respectfully submitted that de Jong does not teach or suggest these features of claim 2. In contrast, de Jong merely describes a content database 340 which provides digital content 365 to an authorized user. De Jong, ¶ 0099.

Additionally, de Jong merely describes that a token is used to validate URL of protected digital content (de Jong, ¶ 0109), and that a content domain directory 604 specifies a directory at content domain indicator 602 that is accessed via a delivery scheme 600 (de Jong, ¶ 0110).

It is respectfully submitted that Challenger fails to disclose the features of claim 2 demonstrated above to be missing from de Jong. Accordingly, a combination of de Jong and Challenger, to the extent proper, could not render independent claim 2, nor any of its dependent claims, obvious. Further Perlman and Winiger fail to disclose those features of claim 2 missing from de Jong and Challenger. Accordingly, respective combinations of de Jong, Challenger, Perlman, and Winiger, to the extent proper, could not render claims depending from claim 2 obvious.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 2-16 based on respective combinations of de Jong, Challenger, Perlman and Winiger is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing it is believed that remaining claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: December 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Erik R. Swanson

Registration No.: 40,833

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicant(s)